[31st October 1931

*A.*—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The District Magistrate did not issue specific instructions to each of the Sub-Magistrates mentioned to prohibit the hoisting of the National flag. The District Magistrate decided that in view of the circumstances of the situation it was undesirable to allow the flag-hoisting ceremony to proceed in places where it was likely to endanger the public peace. The Sub-Magistrates were accordingly instructed that if, on the application of the Police, they found it necessary to prohibit the ceremony, they should issue an order on the lines of that drafted by the District Magistrate for their guidance.

*Alleged instructions to local authorities to prevent the flag-hoisting ceremony.*

* 438 *Q.*—Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government issued any instructions to the local authorities to prevent flag-hoisting ceremony on the 30th August; if so, the reasons therefor;

(*b*) whether the flag-hoisting ceremony was observed in all parts of the Presidency except Chittoor district; whether it was prevented in those parts of the Presidency;

(*c*) why was the Union Jack paraded in Chittoor through the streets by the Police Reserve constables on the morning of the 30th August and whether the same was hoisted in the Town Police Station, and, if so, why?

*A.*—(*a*) No.

(*b*) The Government understand that the flag-hoisting ceremony was observed in several districts but have no detailed information of the particular places in which it was observed. In the Chittoor district it was temporarily prohibited in the following places:—

Kuppam, Tirupati, Tirumalai, Chittoor, Puttur, Narayanavaram, Tiruttani, and Kalahasti.

(*c*) The police apparently wished to make a demonstration.

*Prohibition of all flag-hoisting ceremonies.*

* 439 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether all flag-hoisting ceremonies have been prohibited by the Sub-Magistrates of Tirupati, Puttur and Tiruttani, in their respective jurisdictions, and if so, why;

(*b*) why such orders have been issued in spite of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact; and

(*c*) what steps the Government have taken to cancel them?

31st October 1931]

*A.*—(*a*) & (*b*) The hon. Member is referred to the answers to clauses (*a*) and (*b*) of question No. 450 and the answer to question No. 437.

(*c*) None.

*Alleged ban by the First-class Magistrate, Gudur, on the Zamindari Ryots' Conference proposed to be held at Venkatagiri.*

* 440 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased—

(i) to state whether the Government have taken explanation from the Sub-Collector-Magistrate of Gudur for issuing orders under section 144 against the holding of a Zamindari Ryots' Conference at Venkatagiri; and

(ii) to place the correspondence on the table?

*A.*—(i) No.

(ii) No.

*Alleged issue of an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, against the organizers of the Depressed Classes Conference at Eluvankottai.*

* 441 *Q.*—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to lay on the table of this House the report referred to in answer to question No. 164 asked on 5th August 1931?

*A.*—A copy [a] of the Sub-Magistrate's order, dated the 14th June 1931, is placed on the table.

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"The order passed by the Sub-Magistrate is printed in the Appendix. May I know, Sir, whether Government is aware that this order has caused resentment among the depressed classes in view of the fact that they are law abiding and peaceful citizens?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No."

**Labour**

*Operations of the Labour Department in Tinnevelly district.*

* 442 *Q.*—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) when the operations of the Labour Department were started in Tinnevelly district; and

(*b*) to how many taluks the operations of the Labour Department were extended and how many of the taluks are left untouched by the department?

*A.*—(*a*) In 1929–1930.

(*b*) The operations of the department have so far extended to four taluks.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IX on pages 339–340 infra.